REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 18, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 9, 11 and 12 are hereby amended; claims 5 and 13 are hereby canceled and claim 15 is newly added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-12 and 15 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent 6,983,552 (hereinafter "the '552 patent") in view of claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,923 (hereinafter "the '923 patent"). The Applicant traverses this rejection. The currently pending claims 1-4 and 6-12 are not obvious with respect to the '552 patent in view of the '923 patent. First, neither the '552 patent nor the '923 patent claim "a cooling procedure" as required by independent claims 1 and 9. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to include the "microcomputer stops the heater and the motor, thereby initiating a cooling procedure" and claim 9 has been amended to include "performing a drying procedure, wherein a motor, a heater and an exhaust fan are driven during the drying procedure; performing a cooling procedure, wherein the motor and heater are stopped during the cooling procedure." Since the '552 patent in view of the '923 patent fail to claim a cooling procedure, it is impossible for them to teach stopping the motor and heater during the cooling procedure, as required by the claims. Accordingly, claims 1 and 9 are not obvious, and are therefore patentable, over claims 1-15 of the '552 patent in view of claims 1-11 of the '923 patent. Likewise, claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12, which variously depend from claims 1 and 9, are also patentable for the same reasons.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,739,069 to *Prajescu et al.* (hereinafter "*Prajescu*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that *Prajescu* does not teach every element recited in claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a laundry dryer which includes, among other features, "a microcomputer for controlling a plurality of drivers associated with a heater, motor and exhaust fan according to the sensed temperature signal from said temperature sensor, wherein said microcomputer stops the heater and the motor, thereby initiating a cooling procedure." *Prajescu* fails to disclose this feature.

For at least the aforementioned reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Prajescu*, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2, 4 and 6-8, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reason.

The Office Action rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,454,171 to *Ikeda et al.* (hereinafter "*Ikeda*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Applicant submits that *Ikeda* does not teach every element recited in claim 9 and therefore cannot anticipate this claim. More specifically, claim 9 has been amended to recite a method of controlling a laundry dryer, including "performing a drying procedure, wherein a motor, a heater and an exhaust fan are driven during the drying procedure; performing a cooling procedure, wherein the motor and heater are stopped during the cooling procedure." *Ikeda* fails to disclose these features.

For at least the aforementioned reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over *Ikeda* and requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Prajescu* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,245,764 to *Sung* (hereinafter "*Sung*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As stated above, claim 5 has been cancelled.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicants submit that *Prajescu* in view of *Sung* fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 3. As previously discussed *Prajescu* does not disclose all the features recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claim 3 depends. In particular, claim 1 recites a laundry dryer which includes, among other features "a microcomputer for controlling a plurality of drivers associated with a heater, motor and exhaust fan according to the sensed temperature signal from said temperature sensor, wherein said microcomputer stops the heater and the motor, thereby initiating a cooling procedure." As previously discussed, *Prajescu* fails to disclose this feature.

The Office Action alleges that *Sung* is introduced to overcome the shortcomings of *Prajescu*, namely a motor stoppage step. See page 2 of the Office Action. However, *Sung* fails to teach or suggest a "microcomputer stops the heater and the motor, thereby initiating a cooling procedure, and the exhaust fan driver operates during the cooling procedure," as required by claim 1. Specifically, *Sung* discloses the motor rotates the fan to force air through the drum. See column 3, lines 3-5. Clearly, if the motor of *Sung* is stopped, the exhaust fan is stopped. Therefore, *Sung* cannot possibly teach stopping "the heater and the motor, thereby initiating a cooling procedure, the exhaust fan driver operates during the cooling procedure, such that the exhaust fan draws air out of the drum in the dryer," as required by the claim. Because neither of the references, singularly or in combination teach all the claimed elements, the teaching of *Prajescu* in view of *Sung* does not render the invention obvious.

For at least the aforementioned reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over *Prajescu* in view of *Sung* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeda*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Applicant submits that *Ikeda* fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 10. As previously discussed *Ikeda* does not disclose all the features recited in claim 9, the base claim from which claim 10 depends. In particular, claim 9 recites a method of controlling a laundry dryer, including "performing a drying procedure, wherein a motor, a heater and an exhaust fan are driven during the drying procedure; performing a cooling procedure, wherein the motor and heater are stopped during the cooling procedure." *Ikeda* fails to disclose these features. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over *Ikeda* and the Applicant requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ikeda* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,161,314 to *Souza* (hereinafter "*Souza*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As stated above, claim 13 has been cancelled.

The Applicants submit that *Ikeda* fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 11 and 12. As previously discussed, *Ikeda* does not disclose all the features recited in claim 9, the base claim from which claims 11 and 12 depend. In particular, claim 9 recites a method of controlling a laundry dryer, including "performing a drying procedure, wherein a motor, a heater and an exhaust fan are driven during the drying procedure; performing a cooling procedure, wherein the motor and heater are stopped during the cooling procedure." *Ikeda* fails to disclose these features.

Souza fails to address the previously noted shortcomings of *Ikeda*. Because neither of the references, singularly or in combination teach all the claimed elements, the teaching of *Ikeda* in view of *Souza* do not render the invention obvious. Accordingly, claims 11 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over *Ikeda* in view of *Souza* and the Applicant requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael R. Cooper (Reg. No. 46522)
for Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant